

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The two sheets of two drawings filed contemporaneously includes changes to FIGs. 1 and 2.

REMARKS

Claims 1- 26 are current pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 16, 17, and 20 have been amended. Applicant reserves the right to pursue original claims or any claims in this or any other application.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 16, 17, and 20 have been amended to highlight the differences between the claimed invention and the cited art, but not to overcome the prior art. No new matter has been added.

In the Drawings, FIGs. 1 and 2 stand objected to. As suggested by the Office Action, FIGs. 1 and 2 have been amended to include the labels "Prior Art" therefore the objection so these figures should be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd para. for being indefinite as it "is written in dependant form and depends on itself." Claim 5 has been amended to correct the obvious typographical error. Therefore, the rejection to claim 5 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17, 20-23, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Roche et al (EP-1050991)("Roche") in view of Branigan et al (U.S. Pub. No. 20020090089)("Branigan").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method of updating an encryption key in a wireless network, said method comprising: "physically separating a communication device containing an encryption key from a wireless station of said network; physically connecting said removed communications device to a wired portion of said network which contains an encryption key generator; replacing an existing encryption key in said communications device with a new encryption key from said generator using a communication over said wired portion of said network; and physically reconnecting said communications device containing said new encryption key with wireless station of said network."

Roche discloses a ‘dynamic validation system having a key that is generated at regular intervals.’ (Roche, paras. [0021] – [0022]) Branigan discloses “[t]echniques for secure connections between wireless network clients and wired network resources.” (Branigan, Abstract)

Neither Roche nor Branigan, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest “physically separating a communication device...physically connecting said removed communications device ..and physically reconnecting said communications device containing said new encryption key with wireless station of said network.” (emphasis added). As the Office Action notes, “Roche does not explicitly disclose separating and connecting a communication device [to] a wireless and wireless network.” Nor is there provided any motivation to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan. Assuming *arguendo* that there was motivation provided to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan, the combined teachings would not achieve the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1 and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, a wireless network comprising “a wired station connected to a wired network, said wired station comprising: an encryption key generator for generating an encryption key; and a wired network communications device for transmitting said encryption key over said wired network; a wireless station wirelessly connected to said wired network, said wireless station comprising: a wireless network communications device containing an encryption key, said wireless network communications device being physically disconnectable from said wireless station and physically connectable to said wired network to receive and store as a new encryption key, an encryption key transmitted over said wired network by said wired network communications device.”

Neither Roche nor Branigan, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest “said wireless network communications device being physically disconnectable from said wireless station and physically connectable to said wired network to receive and store as a new encryption key.” (emphasis added) As the Office Action notes, “Roche does not explicitly disclose a wireless station wirelessly connected to said wired network....” Nor is there provided any motivation to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan. Assuming *arguendo* that there was motivation provided to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan, the combined teachings would not achieve the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 10, and 13-16 depend from claim 8 and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, a wireless network wireless station comprising “a wireless network communications device for conducting wireless communications with a wired network, said wireless network communications device being physically removable from said station and storing an updateable encryption key used in conducting encrypted wireless communications, said removable wireless network communications device being physically connectable to a wired network to receive and store a new encryption key.”

Neither Roche nor Branigan, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest “said removable wireless network communications device being physically connectable to a wired network to receive and store a new encryption key.” (emphasis added) As the Office Action notes, “Roche does not explicitly disclose a wireless station wirelessly connected to said wired network....” Nor is there provided any motivation to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan. Assuming *arguendo* that there was motivation provided to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan, the combined teachings would not achieve the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and incorporates all the limitations thereof and is allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, a wireless network communications device comprising: “a removable wireless communications network card adapted to be physically connected to and disconnected from a wireless station card interface; a storage area on said network card which stores an updateable encryption key for use in conducting encrypted wireless network communications, said encryption key being updateable when said card is physically connected to a wired network card interface which supplies a new encryption key.”

Neither Roche nor Branigan, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest “a removable wireless communications network card adapted to be physically connected to and disconnected from a wireless station card interface...said encryption key being updateable when said card is physically connected to a wired network card interface which supplies a new encryption key.” (emphasis added) As the Office Action notes, “Roche does not explicitly disclose a removable wireless communications network card adapted to be connected to and disconnected from a wireless station card interface.” Nor is there provided any motivation to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan. Assuming *arguendo* that there was motivation provided to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan, the combined teachings would not achieve the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claim 17 should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, an encryption key programming system comprising: “an encryption key generator connected to a wired network; a programming device connected to said wired network for receiving over a wire connection an encryption key from said generator, said programming device being adapted to physically receive a wireless network communications device and storing said received encryption key in said wireless network communications device.”

Neither Roche nor Branigan, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest “said programming device being adapted to physically receive a wireless network communications device and storing said received encryption key in said wireless network communications device.” (emphasis added) As the Office Action notes, “Roche does not explicitly disclose a wireless network communication device.” Nor is there provided any motivation to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan. Assuming *arguendo* that there was motivation provided to combine the teachings of Roche with the teachings of Branigan, the combined teachings would not achieve the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claim 20 should be withdrawn.

Claims 21-23 and 26 depend from claim 20 and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Claims 4-5, 11-12, and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Roche in view of Branigan and Trieger at al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,750)(“Trieiger”).

Claims 4-5, 11-12, and 24-25 depend from claims 1, 8, and 20, respectively, and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Trieiger discloses “A method and system for tracking communications in a client-server environment..” (Trieiger, abstract) Furthermore, neither Roche nor Branigan nor Trieiger, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claims 4-5, 11-12, and 24-25 should be withdrawn.

Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Roche in view of Branigan and Serceki et al (U.S. Pub. No. 20030078072)(“Serceki”).

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17 and incorporates, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Serceki discloses a “method for providing configuration information for use in a new wireless station to a wireless network.” (Serceki, Abstract). Neither Roche nor Branigan nor Serceki, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claims 18 and 19 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Michael A. Weinstein

Registration No.: 53,754

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant